



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/674,288

09/29/2003

Amit Bagga

503018-A-01-US (Bagga)

3129

47702 7590 04/02/2007
RYAN, MASON & LEWIS, LLP
1300 POST ROAD
SUITE 205
FAIRFIELD, CT 06824

EXAMINER

TRUONG, THANHNGA B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2135

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

04/02/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/674,288	Applicant(s) BAGGA ET AL.	
	Examiner Thanhnga B. Truong	Art Unit 2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Thanhnga B. Truong
AU 2135

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed on January 17, 2007. Claims 1-33 are pending. At this time, claims 1-33 are still rejected.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed on January 17, 2007 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Watkins (US 5,719,560).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-7, 10, and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moy (US 5,425,102), and further in view of Watkins (US 5,719,560).

a. *Referring to claim 1:*

i. Moy teaches a method for generating a password for a user (column 3, lines 25-31 of Moy), comprising:

(1) presenting said user with a plurality of hints [i.e., the password identification system 3A invokes the hint system 2 in response to the user selecting the "Hint" menu choice on the display shown in FIG. 3. The hint system 2 then presents the prerecorded password hint to the user in a manner such as that illustrated by the display presented in FIG. 4 in an attempt to jog the user's memory to recall the password. If the initial password hint does not accomplish this goal, a succession of additional, and typically more specific password hints, can be provided to the user to ultimately induce the user to recall the password (column 3, lines 58-67 of Moy)];

(2) receiving a user selection of one of said hints; automatically generating a password based on said selected hint [i.e., upon receipt of the password hint request at step 21, the hint system 2 uses the user identification to retrieve the password-password hint data from memory at step 22. Hint system 2 at step 23 transmits the first of the sequence of hints in this retrieved data to the user via a display such as that illustrated in FIG. 4. The user reads the hint and then can activate the "OK" legend on the menu display to return to the password sequence of the requesting process. Alternatively, the hint system 2 assumes complete control over the password process and provides a password entry screen such as that illustrated in FIG. 3 or provides a display which combines the hint screen of FIG. 4 with a password entry line such as that used in FIG. 3 (column 4, lines 25-38 of Moy)]; and

(3) presenting said selected hint to said user to reinforce said generated password [i.e., hint system 2 at step 23 transmits the first of the sequence of hints in this retrieved data to the user via a display such as that illustrated in FIG. 4. The user reads the hint and then can activate the "OK" legend on the menu display to return to the password sequence of the requesting process. Alternatively, the hint system 2 assumes complete control over the password process and provides a password entry screen such as that illustrated in FIG. 3 or provides a display which combines the hint screen of FIG. 4 with a password entry line such as that used in FIG. 3 (column 4, lines 28-38 of Moy)].

ii. Although Moy teaches a method for generating a password for a user (column 3, lines 25-31 of Moy), Moy is silent on the capability of automatically generating a password. On the other hand, Watkins teaches this limitation in column 3, lines 49-59 of Watkins.

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified the invention of Moy with the teaching of Watkins (if indeed is not inherent in Moy) to enhance the level of security of methods of automatic verification of personal identity (see abstract of Watkins).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified the invention of Moy with the teaching of Watkins (if indeed is not inherent in Moy) for making it more convenient for a user to use password protection for files and to encrypt files (**column 1, lines 7-9 of Moy**).

b. Referring to claim 2:

i. Moy further teaches:

(1) wherein said plurality of hints include one or more of textual, audio or visual hints [**i.e., a likely first hint could be: Childhood friend. A second hint could then be: Reptilian pet. The final hint in the sequence could be: My first turtle's name (column 5, lines 17-20).**]

c. Referring to claim 3:

i. Moy further teaches:

(1) wherein said plurality of hints include one or more of poems, songs, jokes, pictures or words [**i.e., a likely first hint could be: Childhood friend. A second hint could then be: Reptilian pet. The final hint in the sequence could be: My first turtle's name (column 5, lines 17-20).**]

d. Referring to claim 4:

i. Moy further teaches:

(1) wherein said generated password is further based on a user input [**i.e., the user must thereafter enter a password that exactly matches the password initially input by the user to obtain access to the protected data file (column 3, lines 29-32 of Moy).**]

e. Referring to claim 5:

i. Moy further teaches:

(1) further comprising the step of presenting said selected hint and said generated password to said user at enrollment [**i.e., the hint system 2 operates to provide the user with a password hint as illustrated in flow diagram form in FIG. 2. The process is initiated at step 21 by a one of password identification system 3A or encryption/decryption system 3B transmitting a password hint request to hint system 2. This process is initiated in one of**

password identification system 3A or encryption/decryption system 3B by the user electing to activate the hint system 2 pursuant to a menu choice "Hint" as illustrated in FIG. 3. The request received by hint system 2 identifies the user so that the hint system can identify the proper set of hints to be presented to the user. The user identification is obtained either by identifying the terminal device from which the data file access request has originated or by the user entering a user identification as part of the standard login process (column 4, lines 3-18 of Moy)].

f. Referring to claim 6:

i. Moy further teaches:

(1) further comprising the step of sending said selected hint to said user as a reinforcement of said generated password [i.e., hint system 2 at step 23 transmits the first of the sequence of hints in this retrieved data to the user via a display such as that illustrated in FIG. 4. The user reads the hint and then can activate the "OK" legend on the menu display to return to the password sequence of the requesting process. Alternatively, the hint system 2 assumes complete control over the password process and provides a password entry screen such as that illustrated in FIG. 3 or provides a display which combines the hint screen of FIG. 4 with a password entry line such as that used in FIG. 3 (column 4, lines 28-38 of Moy)].

g. Referring to claim 7:

i. Moy further teaches:

(1) further comprising the step of recording said selected hint and said generated password in a record associated with said user [i.e., hint system 2 maintains in memory a set of password (or user ID)-password hint sequences for each user of computer system 1 who has initiated a password protection system data file protection sequence. The password data can be encoded, scrambled or dispersed in the storage medium, and the password hints can be similarly managed (column 4, lines 19-25 of Moy)].

h. Referring to claim 10:

i. Moy further teaches:

(1) wherein said plurality of hints includes a plurality of words and said generated password is based on a subset of said words selected by said user [i.e., **a likely first hint could be: Childhood friend. A second hint could then be: Reptilian pet. The final hint in the sequence could be: My first turtle's name (column 5, lines 17-20 of Moy)**].

i. Referring to claim 27:

i. This claim consist a apparatus for generating a password for a user to implement claim 1, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 1 above.

ii. Moy further teaches:

(1) a memory; and at least one processor, coupled to the memory [i.e., **hint system 2 maintains in memory a set of password (or user ID)-password hint sequences for each user of computer system I who has initiated a password protection system data file protection sequence (column 4, lines 19-22 of Moy)**].

iii. Although Moy is silent on the capability of showing the processor, it is a standard and well know component that every computer system must have in order to run all the function and applications that installs in the particular computer system, such as the hint, the password protection, and the encryption system as shown in Figure 1 of Moy.

iv. Examiner takes Official Notice that:

(1) the one processor, coupled to the memory was well known at the time the invention was made.

iii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified the invention of Moy to show the processor coupled to the memory. Such the processor would have been obvious because Moy teaches applicability to the process of executing the hint system (see Figure 1), and because the processor was well known.

j. Referring to claims 28-29:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claim 2, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 2 above.

k. Referring to claim 30:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 4, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 4 above.

l. Referring to claim 31:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 5, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 5 above.

m. Referring to claim 32:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 6, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 6 above.

n. Referring to claim 33:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 7, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 7 above.

5. Claims 8-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moy (US 5,425,102), in view of Watkins (US 5,719,560), and further in view of Serpa (US 6,954,862 B2).

a. Referring to claim 8:

i. Although Moy and Watkins teaches a method for generating a password for a user using hint system (column 3, lines 25-31 of Moy), They are silent on the capability wherein said selected hint is a poem, which could have been included in the hint system as shown in Figure 1 of Moy, and said generated password has a similar rhyme and meter as said selected poem. On the other hand, Serpa teaches:

(1) The pace, rhythm, or tempo of keystrokes becomes as much a part of the password as the actual letters, numbers, or symbols comprising the password. An unauthorized individual might still obtain the ID and password belonging to a legitimate user but, without knowledge of the correct timing element associated with the password, the information will be useless. Because the password is pace, rhythm, or tempo sensitive, access is restricted to those who know both the

Art Unit: 2135

password and the pace, rhythm, or tempo of the password (**column 4, lines 40-49 of Serpa**).

ii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified the combination of teaching between Moy and Watkins with the teaching of Serpa (if indeed is not inherent in Moy) to increase the security afforded by passwords and to make them easier to use (**column 2, lines 24-26 of Serpa**).

iii. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified the combination of teaching between Moy and Watkins with the teaching of Serpa (if indeed is not inherent in Moy) for making it more convenient for a user to use password protection for files and to encrypt files (**column 1, lines 7-9 of Moy**).

b. Referring to claim 9:

i. Although Moy and Watkins teaches a method for generating a password for a user using hint system (column 3, lines 25-31 of Moy), They are silent on the capability wherein said plurality of hints includes a plurality of jokes, which could have been included in the hint system as shown in Figure 1 of Moy, each containing one of a number of different variations for one or more variable words or phrases included in each joke and said generated password includes said variations for said one or more variable words or phrases [**i.e., a likely first hint could be: Childhood friend. A second hint could then be: Reptilian pet. The final hint in the sequence could be: My first turtle's name (column 5, lines 17-20 of Moy)**]. On the other hand, Serpa teaches:

(1) The pace, rhythm, or tempo of keystrokes becomes as much a part of the password as the actual letters, numbers, or symbols comprising the password. An unauthorized individual might still obtain the ID and password belonging to a legitimate user but, without knowledge of the correct timing element associated with the password, the information will be useless. Because the password is pace, rhythm, or tempo sensitive, access is restricted to those who know both the

Art Unit: 2135

password and the pace, rhythm, or tempo of the password (**column 4, lines 40-49 of Serpa**).

ii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified the combination of teaching between Moy and Watkins with the teaching of Serpa (if indeed is not inherent in Moy) to increase the security afforded by passwords and to make them easier to use (**column 2, lines 24-26 of Serpa**).

iii. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified the combination of teaching between Moy and Watkins with the teaching of Serpa (if indeed is not inherent in Moy) for making it more convenient for a user to use password protection for files and to encrypt files (**column 1, lines 7-9 of Moy**).

c. Referring to claims 11-12, 14-16, 21-22, 24-26:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claims 8-9, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 8-9 above.

d. Referring to claim 13:

i. Although Moy and Watkins teaches a method for generating a password for a user using hint system (column 3, lines 25-31 of Moy), They are silent on the capability wherein said plurality of hints includes a plurality of image icons, which could have been included in the hint system as shown in Figure 1 of Moy, and said generated password is based on a subset of said image icons selected by said user. On the other hand, Serpa teaches:

(1) The pace, rhythm, or tempo of keystrokes becomes as much a part of the password as the actual letters, numbers, or symbols comprising the password. An unauthorized individual might still obtain the ID and password belonging to a legitimate user but, without knowledge of the correct timing element associated with the password, the information will be useless. Because the password is pace, rhythm, or tempo sensitive, access is restricted to those who know both the

Art Unit: 2135

password and the pace, rhythm, or tempo of the password (**column 4, lines 40-49 of Serpa**).

ii. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to:

(1) have modified the combination of teaching between Moy and Watkins with the teaching of Serpa (if indeed is not inherent in Moy) to increase the security afforded by passwords and to make them easier to use (**column 2, lines 24-26 of Serpa**).

iv. The ordinary skilled person would have been motivated to:

(1) have modified the combination of teaching between Moy and Watkins with the teaching of Serpa (if indeed is not inherent in Moy) for making it more convenient for a user to use password protection for files and to encrypt files (**column 1, lines 7-9 of Moy**).

d. Referring to claims 17-18:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claims 1 and 8-9, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1 and 8-9 above.

e. Referring to claims 19-20:

i. These claims have limitations that is similar to those of claims 1 and 13, thus they are rejected with the same rationale applied against claims 1 and 13 above.

f. Referring to claim 23:

i. This claim has limitations that is similar to those of claim 13, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 13 above.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Michener et al (US 4,802,217) discloses a method and apparatus for securing access to a computer facility (see title).

Art Unit: 2135

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanhnga (Tanya) Truong whose telephone number is 571-272-3858.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached at 571-272-3859. The fax and phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Thanhnga B. Truong
AU 2135

TBT

March 20, 2007